



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for both present and past. The Roman could not literally say: Cæsar having crossed the bridge attacked the enemy, but: Cæsar, the bridge crossed, attacked enemy. French, Césâr ayant passé le pont attaqua l'ennemi, or retaining the Latin construction: Césâr, le pont passé, attaqua l'ennemi, or even: Césâr passant le pont attaqua l'ennemi; It. Cesare avendo passato il ponte attaccò l'inimico, or: Cesare, passato il ponte, attaccò, &c., or: Cesare passando il ponte attaccò l'inimico. And so in the other languages, the Wallachian excepted, which seems to make the simple forms serve for all moods and tenses. I say this with some hesitancy, basing my belief on the silence of Diez, Barciană, Mircesco and others and on my own observation, which, it is true, is not very great in Wallachian literature. A number of parallel passages in the Bible show that, where the most of the other languages use the compound tense or some other equivalent, the Wallachian renders the same by the simple gerund. At any rate my experience is sufficiently extensive to justify me in asserting that the compound, if it occurs at all, is very exceptional.

SAMUEL GARNER.

Indiana University.

ANGLO-SAXONICA.

þ.

Just one year ago, cf. 'M. L. NOTES' I. p. 88, I argued the undesirability of expanding this MS. sign in critical editions, and showed that so far from representing merely *þæt*, it might stand for *þa*, *þæs*, *þone* (or *þam*, *þan*), *þio* and *þe*. My reference to *þ mycele gylþ*, Blickl. 53/21 did not pass unchallenged. Sievers immediately called my attention privately to the accusative *ðæt idelgielþ* Past. 457/23, *on suelc gielþ* 71/1 as evidences of the word being—sporadically at least—neuter. Not to speak of *þ mycele* itself, where the *-e* is neuter inflexion. Kluge also wrote: "Ihr Artikel über *þ* enthält gewiss richtige Beobachtung u. ich gestehe dass ich bisher bei der Lectüre hie u. da (ohne mir Notizen darüber zu machen) *þ* für Schreibfehler für *þe* gehalten habe. Auch jetzt nach Ihren Sammlungen möchte ich lieber einen Schreibfehler annehmen als Dop-

pelwertigkeit des *þ*. Ueber *gielþ* findet sich eine Notiz in Cosijn II."

Sievers, Kluge, and Cosijn are a formidable trio, and nothing could be farther from my wish than to try to controvert them. But is there any need of treating this point as one which does not admit of mutual adjustment? First as to Kluge. Why may we not regard the sign *þ* as standing for two or more words of different phonetic and grammatic value? In many a manuscript, for example, the Durham Gospels, we read in the Latin the sign 7 as *et*, and in the interlinear gloss just above we read it as *and* (or *ond*). Similarly *t* is read *vel* or *oððe*. In an Irish gloss the 7 would be read *ocus*. What serious objection can there be to considering *þ* a mere convenient abbreviation for a number of monosyllabic words having the same *Anlaut* and akin in sense, as the German student of to-day in his *Heft* abbreviates *der*, *die*, *das*, *dem*, *den* to *d.*? Not to speak of *ð* used continually in the Durham Ritual for *ðurh*, *ðorh* = per.

As to *gielþ* being both masculine and neuter, it would be foolish to deny the possibility. Gender is by no means the inflexible quality that modern school grammars make it. In Anglo-Saxon we find a noun varying its gender not only from dialect to dialect, and from century to century, but even on the same page of the same text! Thus, Sievers points to *ðæt idelgielþ* Past. 457/23; but on the same page, line 33, is to be read *ðone gielþ*; and again, 459/1. As regards the *ðæt* in 457/23 may not Sweet have erroneously expanded *þ*? I have counted the number of times that *ðæt* occurs in this connection, namely, pp. 457, 459, 461; the figures are: *ðæt* conjunction (including *ðætte* and *oððet*) 36 times; *ðæt*, pron. art., 18 times; total 54. Not once the sign *þ*. This wears an ominous look. It is too uniform, it drives one to the inference that Sweet has normalized the *þ* throughout his edition of the Pastoral. Let us bear in mind that the Pastoral was his first great undertaking, and that it was done nearly twenty years ago. Not to speak of the Oldest English Texts, which of us will hesitate to pronounce the Orosius much better work? Without finding fault with a self-sacrificing editor who has put us all under lasting obligations, may not one of his bene-

ficiaries raise the direct question: How far does the Pastoral represent literatim the manuscript? And on this particular point, does the MS. *invariably* write out *ðæt*? An explicit assurance from Mr. Sweet (or some expert of equal rank) will, of course, be more satisfactory than any amount of conjecture. Meanwhile, let me call attention to the following, Past. 457/28: *Ne scyle ðeah nan mon for ðæm anum ðingum dōn ðæt ðæt he to gōde deð, ðæt he ne ðyrfe his hlaford ondrædan, ne eft for ðæm anum ðe he wilnige eorðlices lofes.* Translated: "Yet no man must do the good he does, merely that he may not have cause to fear his Lord; or, again, for the desire of earthly praise." This rendering effaces the evident syntactic parallelism of the two motive-clauses. I should prefer to render: "merely *because* he may fear his Lord or *because* he may desire, etc." And I suspect that the MS. reads *ð he ne ðyrfe*, the *ð* standing for *þe*. So, p. 459/1 for *ðæm ðæt* might be read for *ðemðe* cf. NOTES, vol. I. p. 88.

Sievers's inference that *mycele* Blickl. 53/21 is neuter inflexion still remains. There are only two ways of disposing of it: either to assume *mycele* to be a blunder for *mycela* (masc.), or to admit that the weak adj. decl. is capable of an occasional abnormality.

If the reader wishes further instances of *þ*, *ð* not equivalent to *þæt*, he may consider the following:

ð gise[t]tan = ordinatissimam, Epinal 707. Sweet asteriks the *ð* as if a blunder!

þ methælig, Luke xxii, 36 Lind., *ðone* Rushw.

þ fostrað, John vi, 49 Lind., *ðone* Ruschw. Sacculum = *þ seam*, Luke xxii, 36 Lind., *ðonne seom* Rushw. *þ wæs wunden gold on wæn hladen*, Beow. 3134. Had not Zupitza been committed to a doctrine, would he have transliterated *þæt*, instead of the more obvious *þa*, or *þær*?

ê, ê.

Bremer's article on "Germanisches ê," Beiträge xi, 1-76, 262-286, is certainly full of suggestions. Whether all the author's deductions will be accepted just as they stand, is a matter which I must leave to critics capable of broader generalizations than mine. What directly interests me is Bremer's collection of examples from Anglo-Saxon.

By the way, it is surprising to see Merogaisus, p. 19, Meroftedis, p. 21, Merulfus, p. 22, cf. p. 25, set down as *mêr*. Are they not rather *mêr*-, 'sea, meer'? Equally puzzling are the remarks, p. 32, on *rêden*, *hîwrêden*. The form *rêden* is an independent noun, cf. Sievers § 258, Anm. 3, Cosijn I. § 88, p. 103, Kluge §§ 149, 162, conditio = *ræden* Haupt, 436 a/1; *hîwrêden* is no more folk-etymology than are *ðegen-rêden* = retinue, *lim-rêden* = χλαμύς.

The gist of Bremer's conclusions is to be found pp. 271-286. His fundamental position is an Ablaut-scale ê, ô, a, representing respectively high, secondary, and lowest accent-grades. This is easy enough to grasp, but much less easy to apply to the actual phenomena of Anglo-Saxon. ê = Wessex (â) ê, ô = ô, a = a, æ.

The difficulty lies in adjusting Bremer's accentuation with the consonantal changes according to Verner's law. Verner and his followers have taught us that wherever we get in An.-S. *d*, High-German *t* = Ind. Germ. *t*, we must assume the accent to be elsewhere than on the vowel immediately preceding this consonant. The same holds good of the change *s* > *z* > *r*.

If, then, as Bremer holds, p. 278, *blêd* 'renown,' *blêd* 'fruit,' *blæd* 'leaf,' are representatives of Ind. Germ. *bhlê*, *bhlô*, *bhla*, how can we get *blêd* from *blâti* = *bhlêti*? The consonantal change *t* > *p* > *ð* > *d* demands that the chief accent be not on the root-syllable. A like difficulty is offered by *sêd* 'seed,' *grêd* 'greed,' *prêd* 'thread,' *blêdre* 'bladder,' *glêre* 'amber,' *mêðe* 'tired' (cf. Kluge § 233, suffix *-tyo*). In this last word, the English consonant demands root-accent, the umlauting demands suffix-accent.

On the other hand, *brêð* 'breath,' *crêd* 'crowing,' *spêd* 'prosperity' seem to meet all requirements.

The problem is complicated by the observation that outside of the domain of strict Wessex we find *sêd*, *prêd*, *blêdre*, *grêd* 'grass' (evidently connected with *grôwan*, *grâwan*), *spêd* 'spittle' (*spâwan*) cf. Sweet, O. E. T. pp. 605, 606. Nowhere *sêd*, *prêd*, *blêdre*, *grêd*, at least if Sweet's index is to be trusted; that is to say, the ê cannot be *i*-umlaut of ô. Whereas we do get *spêd*, p. 650; neither *crêd* nor *croed*, nor *brêð* occur in Sweet's index.

Bremer will have to reconsider, I fear, some of his Germanic stems. Also some of his English words. Thus *snear*, p. 278 should be *sneark*, lengthened in oblique cases to *snêar*- by dropping of *h*, Sievers, Beiträge x, 488. Bremer takes no note of the *-h*. Where is An.-S. *blêsan* (p. 281) to be found? Not in Sweet's O. E. T., nor in Bosworth-Toller, nor in Wright-Wülker, and expressly rejected by Kluge in his Wörterbuch. As to *grêtan* parallel to *grêotan* 'to weep,' it is also a grammatical fiction.

jehon, *gêon*, to say, assert.

Has the possibility of this verb (=M. H. G. *jehen*) occurring in English been pointed out? Paul, M. D. Gr., § 162, ranks *jehen* in Class V. of the Ablauting verbs. Its proper place in An.-Saxon would be in Sievers, § 391. 2, by the side of *gefêon*, *plêon*, etc., among the verba contracta.

The only evidence known to me of its existence in An.-Saxon is *conticinium*=*cwylltid* † *gebedgiht*, Wr. W. 117/9 (Aelfric's Vocab.). *cwylltid* evidently=(Danish) Icelandic *kveldtimi* 'evening;' *cwild* in Sweet, O. E. T., p. 499, relieves us of necessity of assuming a direct borrowing from the Danish, although this peculiar use betrays Danish influence. *gebed-giht* must mean "prayer-saying." *Conticinium* is frequently used in mediæval Latin to denote a canonical hour, for example, *conticinium* † *gallicinium*=*hancred* Wr. W. 175/36 (Suppl. to Aelf. Vocab.), and 426/10, note. *giht* is analogous in formation to *tyht* (*têon*) Sievers, § 266.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

'THE ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE' AND PROFESSOR SKEAT'S VOCAB- ULARY TEST.

In the third edition of his Chaucer's 'Prioresses Tale' (Oxford, 1880), and again in the Chaucer Society's Essays, Part V, pp. 437-451, Professor Skeat adduces various reasons why 'The Romaunt of the Rose' cannot be Chaucer's translation. Disregarding, for the present, his other proofs, I shall confine myself in this paper to an examination of his Vocabulary

Test, as treated in the Essays, pp. 447-450, especially under C, his third division.

Professor Skeat says: "Whoever will really read the translation, must be struck with the extraordinary number of unusual words in it, especially of words which never occur in Chaucer. Many of these words have been attributed to Chaucer over and over again, but solely on the strength of the translation, and quite erroneously" (p. 445). Under C he adds (p. 447): "The translation abounds with remarkable words; the translator was a great master of language, with a vocabulary of his own; but many of his words are to be found in Barbour, Wyclif, the Promptorium Parvulorum, Havelok, and Piers Plowman, rather than in Chaucer." Of these words he then notes 189, not counting repetitions of the same word.

Without entering upon an exhaustive discussion of the vocabulary of the 'Romaunt,' I hope to show:

1. That, of the peculiar words noted, a large proportion are in no true sense the translator's own, but are directly or indirectly borrowed from his original, while in many other cases they are required by some exigency of his verse.

2. That some of these words are to be found in one of Chaucer's undoubted poems.

3. That, disregarding such considerations as are brought forward in 1 and 2, it is unsafe to found an argument concerning the genuineness of a work upon the peculiar words which it exhibits, when compared with the admitted productions of the author in question.

These positions will now be examined in detail.

1. An examination of the words instanced will cast some light upon the originality displayed in selecting or appropriating them. They may be arranged under the following sub-divisions:

A. Old French riming words retained and slightly Anglicized, the associate riming word being similarly retained and Anglicized: *accusith* 1591; *allege* 6628; *aqueyntable* 2213; *assise* 1237; *avenaunt* 1263; *batayled* 4162; *baude* 5677; *beau sire* 6056; *bygyns* 6863, *bygynne* 7368; *borderillers* 7036; *bosarde* 4033; *cherisaunce* 3337; *conisaunce* 5468; *custommere* 4939; *entailled*